



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/444,617	11/22/1999	VIKTORS BERTIS	AUS990889US1	8893

7590

08/21/2003

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
P.O. BOX 969
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0969

EXAMINER

ALI, AHMEDUR R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/444,617

Applicant(s)

BERSTIS ET AL.

Examiner

Ahmedur Ali

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 November 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The application has been examined. Claims 1-6 are pending in this office action.

Drawings

2. The drawings filed on November 11, 1999 are objected to by the Draftsperson.

Formal and corrected drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reardon (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,635).
2. As per claim 1, Reardon teaches a method for verifying control access between a device on a non-proprietary bus and a device on a proprietary bus (see abstract; col. 3, lines 55-58; col. 5, lines 58-62), said method comprising the steps of:

in response to a determination that a non-proprietary device is registered to more than one gateway controller, determining whether or not said non-proprietary device is a portable device (see col. 2, lines 51-57; col. 17, lines 41-64; col. 18, lines 20-26).

in response to a determination that said non-propriety device is a portable device, determining whether or not a number of acceptable duplication has been exceeded (see col. 2, lines 51-57; col. 24, lines 24-65; col. 25, lines 21-48); and

in response to a determination that said number of acceptable duplication has been exceeded, setting a flag to indicate a violation of said control access (see col. 24, lines 24-65; col. 25, lines 21-48).

3. Reardon teaches claim 2 is rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, wherein said method further includes a step of setting a flag to indicate a violation of said control access, in response to a determination that said non-proprietary device is not a portable device (see col. 11, lines 43-65; col. 24, lines 24-65).

4. As per claim 3, Reardon teaches a system capable of verifying control access between a device on a non-proprietary bus and a device on a proprietary bus (see abstract; col. 3, lines 55-58; col. 5, lines 58-62), said system comprising:

means for determining whether or not a non-proprietary device is registered to more than one gateway controller (see col. 17, lines 41-64; col. 18, lines 20-26);

means for determining whether or not said non-proprietary device is a portable device, in response to a determination that a non-proprietary device is registered to more than one gateway controller (see col. 2, lines 51-57; col. 17, lines 35-64; col. 18, lines 20-26; col. 22, lines 40-64).

a means for determining whether or not a number of acceptable duplication has been exceeded, in response to a determination that said non-propriety device is not a portable device (see col. 6, lines 1-8; col. 11, lines 43-65; col. 24, lines 24-65); and

means for setting a flag to indicate a violation of said control access, in response to a determination that said number of acceptable duplication has been exceeded (see col. 24, lines 24-65; col. 25, lines 21-48).

5. Reardon teaches claim 4 is rejected as above in rejecting claim 3, wherein said system further includes a means for setting a flag to indicate a violation of said control access, in response to a determination that said non-proprietary device is not a portable device (see col. 6, lines 1-8; col. 11, lines 43-65; col. 24, lines 24-65).

6. As per claim 5, Reardon teaches a computer program product residing on a computer usable medium for verifying control access between a device on a non-proprietary bus and a device on a proprietary bus (see abstract; col. 3, lines 55-58; col. 5, lines 58-62), said program product comprising:

program code means for determining whether or not a non-proprietary device is registered to more than one gateway controller (see col. 17, lines 41-64; col. 18, lines 20-26);

program code means for determining whether or not said non-proprietary device is a portable device, in response to a determination that a non-proprietary device is registered to more than one gateway controller (see col. 2, lines 51-57; col. 17, lines 35-64; col. 18, lines 20-26; col. 22, lines 40-64).

a program code means for determining whether or not a number of acceptable duplication has been exceeded, in response to a determination that said non-proprietary device is not a portable device (see col. 6, lines 1-8; col. 11, lines 43-65; col. 24, lines 24-65); and

Art Unit: 2131

program code means for setting a flag to indicate a violation of said control access, in response to a determination that said number of acceptable duplication has been exceeded (see col. 24, lines 24-65; col. 25, lines 21-48).

5. Reardon teaches claim 6 is rejected as above in rejecting claim 5, wherein said computer program further includes a program code means for setting a flag to indicate a violation of said control access, in response to a determination that said non-proprietary device is not a portable device (see col. 6, lines 1-8; col. 11, lines 43-65; col. 24, lines 24-65).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Alterman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,045) disclose a method for accessing an information network from a radio communication system.

Gruse et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,538) disclose a system for tracking end-user electronic content usage.

Byford (U.S. Patent No. 6,581,161) discloses a system, portable device, server, apparatus and method for controlling access to a secure location or container.

Yaegashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,499,106) disclose a method and apparatus for secure distribution of information recorded on fixed media.

Casey (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,486) discloses an electronic paging device including a computer connection port.

Lawman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,938) disclose a non-proprietary local bus.

Lawman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,565) disclose a non-proprietary local bus.

Wright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,066) disclose an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) data bus (IDB).

Christensen et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0014536) disclose an intelligent linking device and method.


Wang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,765,027) disclose a network controller, which enables the local processor to have greater access to at least one memory device than the host computer in response to a control signal.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ahmedur Ali whose telephone number is 305-4667. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-3900.

ara
August 14, 2003


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100